

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DAVEION PERRY,)	CASE NO. 1:17 CV 257
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
)	
v.)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
CHARLES A. SWANSON,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Pro se Plaintiff Daveion Perry filed the above-captioned action against his criminal defense attorney Charles A. Swanson. In the Complaint, he alleges Swanson did not provide him with effective assistance of counsel and induced him to accept a plea deal. He seeks unspecified monetary compensation and asks the Court to assist him with filing complaint against Swanson with the bar association for professional misconduct.

Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff alleges he was in the Cleveland Heights jail, having been charged with one count of aggravated murder, five counts of aggravated robbery, four counts of kidnaping, two counts of felonious assault, and one count of breaking and entering, all with three-year and one-year firearm specifications, as well as one count of obstructing official business and one count of tampering with evidence. Swanson was appointed to represent him at trial. Plaintiff contends that Swanson coerced him to accept a plea deal in which he would plead guilty to the charges in exchange for the dismissal of the one-year firearm specifications. The court

sentenced him to life in prison without parole. He asserts Swanson denied him the effective assistance of counsel and violated the rules of attorney professional responsibility. He asks the court to award him monetary damages for pain and suffering and to assist him with filing a ethics complaint against Swanson with the local bar association.

Standard of Review

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the Court is required to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); *Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville*, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law or fact when it is premised on an indisputably meritless legal theory or when the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327.

A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it lacks “plausibility in the Complaint.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 564 (2007). A pleading must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The factual allegations in the pleading must be sufficient to raise the right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all the allegations in the Complaint are true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The Plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but must provide more than “an unadorned, the Defendant unlawfully harmed me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. A pleading that offers legal conclusions or a simple recitation of the elements of a cause of action

will not meet this pleading standard. *Id.* In reviewing a Complaint, the Court must construe the pleading in the light most favorable to the Plaintiff. *Bibbo v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 151 F.3d 559, 561 (6th Cir. 1998)

Discussion

Plaintiff cannot bring a civil rights claim against his attorney for providing ineffective assistance of counsel. As an initial matter, a prisoner may not raise claims in a civil rights action if a judgment on the merits of those claims would affect the validity of his conviction or sentence, unless the conviction or sentence has been set aside. *See Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641, 646 (1997); *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486 (1994). A claim for damages bearing that relationship to a conviction or sentence that has not been so invalidated is not cognizable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Therefore, when a state prisoner seeks damages in a § 1983 suit, the Court must consider whether a judgment in favor of the Plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence. If it would, the Complaint must be dismissed unless the Plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated. If the Court determines that the Plaintiff's action, even if successful, will not demonstrate the invalidity of any outstanding criminal judgment against him, the action should be allowed to proceed, in the absence of some other bar to the suit. Here, Plaintiff's ineffective assistance of counsel claim, if found to have merit, would call his conviction into question. Plaintiff's conviction is currently on appeal before the Ohio Eighth District Court of Appeals. He cannot proceed with this action, unless his conviction is overturned on appeal.


Moreover, even if the Ohio Court of Appeals reverses his conviction, Plaintiff will not be able to bring claims against Swanson under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To establish a *prima facie* case

under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff must assert that a person acting under color of state law deprived him of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States. *Parratt v. Taylor*, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981). Generally to be considered to have acted "under color of state law," the person must be a state or local government official or employee. A private party may be found to have acted under color of state law to establish the first element of this cause of action only when the party "acted together with or ... obtained significant aid from state officials" and did so to such a degree that its actions may properly be characterized as "state action." *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 937 (1982). An individual may also be considered a state actor if he or she exercises powers traditionally reserved to a state. *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345, 352 (1974). A public defender or a court-appointed defense counsel, while acting in that capacity, is not a state actor for purposes of § 1983. *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 321 (1981).

Conclusion

Accordingly, this action is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e). The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.


DONALD C. NUGENT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 12, 2017
¹ 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides:

An appeal may not be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that it is not taken in good faith.